



REP. TOM PRICE, M.D. (R-GA), CHAIRMAN  
PAUL TELLER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
424 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

rsc.price.house.gov

ph (202) 226-9717 / fax (202) 226-1633

## Legislative Bulletin.....April 22, 2009

### Contents:

**H.R. 749** - To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to permit candidates for election for Federal office to designate an individual who will be authorized to disburse funds of the authorized campaign committees of the candidate in the event of the death of the candidate

**H.Con.Res. 86** - Authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for the unveiling of a bust of Sojourner Truth

**H.R. 586** - Civil Rights History Project Act

**H.R. 1679** - House Reservists Pay Adjustment Act

**S.J.Res. 8** - A joint resolution providing for the appointment of David M. Rubenstein as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

**H.Con.Res. \_\_** - Providing for the acceptance of a statue of Ronald Wilson Reagan from the people of California for placement in the United States Capitol

**H.R. 1580** - Electronic Waste Research and Development Act

**H.R. 957** - Green Energy Education Act

**H.R. 1139** - COPS Improvements Act

**H.R. 1626** - Statutory Time-Periods Technical Amendments Act

**H.R. 1824** - Best Buddies Empowerment for People with Intellectual Disabilities Act

**H.Res. 247** - Expressing support for "National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day"

**H.Res. 336** - Acknowledging and Commending National Library Week

---

---

**H.R. 749—To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to permit candidates for election for Federal office to designate an individual who will be authorized to disburse funds of the authorized campaign committees of the candidate in the event of the death of the candidate (Jones, R-NC)**

**Order of Business:** The bill is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, April 22, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. H.R. 749 is identical to H.R. 3032 which passed the House by voice vote in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress.

**Summary:** The bill would amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to permit candidates for election to federal office to:

- Designate an individual for each of a candidate's authorized campaign committees who will be authorized to disburse funds of the committee in the event of the candidate's death; and
- Designate another individual to carry out the responsibilities of the designated individual in the event of the death or incapacity of the designated individual or the designated individual's unwillingness to carry out the responsibilities.

Under current law, this role lies with the campaign treasurer. The Federal Election Commission (FEC) would be responsible for regulating the process and registering the information.

The bill also details the procedures for filing and revoking such a designation. The bill would also permit the filing of a designation to contain the candidate's instructions regarding the disbursement of funds.

**Committee Action:** H.R. 749 was introduced on January 28, 2009, and referred to the House Committee on House Administration, which held a mark-up on March 25, 2009, and reported the bill by voice vote.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** According to CBO, "Based on information from the FEC, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 749 would cost the FEC about \$500,000 in 2010, subject to the availability of appropriated funds. That amount includes one-time, computer-related expenses as well as the cost of issuing new regulations. In future years, the legislation would increase general administrative costs of the FEC, but we estimate that those costs would be insignificant."

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?** No.

**Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** While no committee report was available for H.R. 749, according to last year's report, [House Report 110 - 602](#), H.R. 3032 "does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI."

**Constitutional Authority:** While no committee report was available for H.R. 749, last year's report, [House Report 110 - 602](#), cites constitutional authority in Article 1, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to make law governing the time, place and manner of holding federal elections.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Natalie Farr; [natalie.farr@mail.house.gov](mailto:natalie.farr@mail.house.gov) 202-226-0718

**H.Con.Res. 86—Authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the  
Capitol Visitor Center for the unveiling of a bust of Sojourner Truth  
(*Jackson-Lee, D-TX*)**

**Order of Business:** The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, April 22, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

**Summary:** H.Con.Res. 86 resolves that the House of Representatives (and the Senate concurring):

- Authorization- Allows Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center to be used for an event on April 28, 2009, to unveil a bust of Sojourner Truth.
- Preparations- Requires physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

**Committee Action:** H.Con.Res. 86 was introduced on March 30, 2009 and referred to the House Committee on House Administration, which took no subsequent public action.

**Administration Position:** No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The resolution would not authorize any additional expenditures.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?:** Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Natalie Farr; [natalie.farr@mail.house.gov](mailto:natalie.farr@mail.house.gov) 202-226-0718

---

---

**H.R. 586— Civil Rights History Project Act (*McCarthy, D-NY*)**

**Order of Business:** H.R. 586 is scheduled for consideration on Wednesday, April 22, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. The bill is identical to H.R. 998 which passed the House by voice vote in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress.

**Summary:** H.R. 586 would require the Librarian of Congress (LOC) and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution to establish an oral history project, including video and audio recordings, visual and written materials relevant to participants in the Civil Rights

movement. The bill would allow the LOC to accept and spend donations for such projects. The bill authorizes \$500,000 for FY 2010 and “such sums” for FY2011-2014.

**Committee Action:** H.R. 586 was introduced on January 15, 2009 and referred to the House Committee on House Administration. On March 25, 2009 the Committee held a mark-up and reported the bill by voice vote.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** According to CBO, “based on information from the two agencies, and assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 586 would cost \$4 million over the 2010-2014 period... Enacting H.R. 586 could affect direct spending, but the spending would be offset by the amount of the donations, which would be credited as offsetting receipts. Thus, CBO estimates that enacting the provision would not have a significant net effect on direct spending.”

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** Yes, the bill authorizes a new project at the LOC.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?** No.

**Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** While no committee report was available for H.R. 586, according to last year’s report, [House Committee Report 110-848](#) reads, “Clause 9 of House Rule XXI requires committee reports on public bills and resolutions to contain an identification of congressional ‘earmarks,’ limited tax benefits, limited tariff benefits, and the names of requesting Members. The bill contains no such items either as introduced or as reported to the House.”

**Constitutional Authority:** While no committee report was available for H.R. 586, last year’s report, [House Committee Report 110-848](#), cites constitutional authority under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Natalie Farr; [natalie.farr@mail.house.gov](mailto:natalie.farr@mail.house.gov) 202-226-0718.

---

---

## **H.R. 1679—House Reservists Pay Adjustment Act (Brady, D-PA)**

**Order of Business:** The bill is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, April 22, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. The bill is identical to H.R. 6608 which passed the House of Representatives by voice vote in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress.

**Summary:** H.R. 1679 would require the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) of the House of Representatives to pay lost income to House employees who are reservists and are called up for in active duty military service while working in the House. The bill would require the CAO to compensate the difference between an employee’s regular

salary and the amount they are paid while on active duty. The bill would apply to House employees who are employed by the House for at least 90 days prior to reporting for active duty.

Under the legislation, the CAO would not make payments if the amount would be less than \$50. In addition, the CAO would be required to reduce the House employee's payments if their income is supplemented by a third source. The bill would not apply to employees of the Senate.

H.R. 1679 would authorize "such sums" as necessary for the CAO to provide payments to reservist House employees that are called into active duty service.

**Additional Background:** According to a cost estimate prepared by CBO, there are "very few" House employees that have ever been called up to active duty as reservists. Therefore, although CBO does not specify the exact number of House employees that are members of an armed force's reserve branch, they predict that enacting the legislation would not significantly increase discretionary spending.

**Committee Action:** H.R. 1679 was introduced on March 24, 2009, and referred to the Committee on House Administration, as well as the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The Committee on House Administration held a mark-up on March 25, 2009 and reported the bill by voice vote.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** According to CBO, H.R. 1679 would not have an impact on federal spending.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?** No.

**Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** A committee report regarding compliance with House Rules regarding earmarks and limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits is not available.

**Constitutional Authority:** A committee report citing constitutional authority is not available.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Natalie Farr; [natalie.farr@mail.house.gov](mailto:natalie.farr@mail.house.gov) 202-226-0718.

---

**S.J.Res 8—A joint resolution providing for the appointment of David M. Rubenstein as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (*Senator Leahy, D-VT*)**

**Order of Business:** The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, April 22, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

**Summary:** The resolution appoints David M. Rubenstein of Maryland to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for a term of 6 years, effective on the date of enactment of this joint resolution. He will take the place of Anne d'Harnoncourt of Pennsylvania whose term expired.

**Additional Background:** David M. Rubenstein is a Co-Founder and Managing Director of The Carlyle Group, one of the world's largest private equity firms. Mr. Rubenstein co-founded the firm in 1987. From 1973-75, Mr. Rubenstein practiced law in New York with Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison. From 1975-76 he served as Chief Counsel to the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments. From 1977-1981, during the Carter Administration, Mr. Rubenstein was Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy. After his White House service and before co-founding Carlyle, Mr. Rubenstein practiced law in Washington with Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge (now Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw Pittman).

**Committee Action:** S.J.Res. 8 was introduced on February 10, 2009 and referred to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. The committee discharged the resolution by unanimous consent on March 17, 2009. On the same day, the resolution passed the Senate by unanimous consent.

**Administration Position:** No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The resolution would not authorize any additional expenditures.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?:** Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Natalie Farr; [natalie.farr@mail.house.gov](mailto:natalie.farr@mail.house.gov) 202-226-0718.

---

---

**H.R. 1580—Electronic Waste Research and Development Act (*Gordon, D-TN*)**

**Order of Business:** The bill is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday April 22, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** H.R. 1580 would authorize \$84 million over 5 years for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to provide grants to institutions of higher education to support demonstration projects related to the recycling of electronic devices, such as computers, printers, and copiers. This legislation also would authorize appropriations for the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to develop a database of alternative materials for use in electronic devices. In addition, the legislation would require the National Academy of Sciences to issue a report to address how to reduce electronic waste.

**Committee Action:** On March 18, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Science and Technology. On March 26, 2009 the Committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by Voice Vote.

**Administration Position:** No Statement of Administration Policy was provided.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** According to CBO, H.R.1580 would authorize \$84 million over the 2010-2014 period. Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or revenues.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?:** Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

**Constitutional Authority:** A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable for H.R. 1580.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Bruce F. Miller, [bruce.miller@mail.house.gov](mailto:bruce.miller@mail.house.gov), (202)-226-9720.

---

---

## **H.R. 957—Green Energy Education Act of 2009 (McCaul, R-TX)**

**Order of Business:** The bill is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday April 22, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** H.R. 957 authorizes the Secretary of Energy, in carrying out research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities authorized for the Department of Energy, to contribute funds to the National Science Foundation (NSF) for



the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program to support projects that enable graduate education related to such activities.

The bill would also authorize the Secretary, in carrying out advanced energy technology research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities authorized for the Department of Energy related to high performance buildings, to contribute funds to curriculum development activities at the NSF for the purpose of improving undergraduate or graduate interdisciplinary engineering and architecture education related to the design and construction of high performance buildings, including development of curricula, of laboratory activities, of training practicums, or of design projects.

**Additional Background:** According to the bills sponsor, a primary goal of curriculum development activities supported under this bill is to improve the ability of engineers, architects, and planners to work together on the incorporation of advanced energy technologies during the design and construction of high performance buildings.

**Committee Action:** On March 18, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Science and Technology. On March 26, 2009 the Committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by voice vote.

**Administration Position:** No Statement of Administration Policy was provided.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** A CBO score for H.R. 957 was not available at press time.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?:** Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

**Constitutional Authority:** A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable for H.R. 957.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Bruce F. Miller, [bruce.miller@mail.house.gov](mailto:bruce.miller@mail.house.gov), (202)-226-9720.

---

---

## **H.R. 1139 — COPS Improvement Act (*Weiner, D-NY*)**

**Order of Business:** The bill is scheduled for consideration on Wednesday, April 22, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. H.R. 1139 is similar to H.R. 1700 which passed the House in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress, by a vote of [381-34](#).



**\*NOTE:** The authorization level for last year's bill was \$1.15 billion per year which is significantly lower than the bill under consideration tomorrow.

**Summary:** H.R. 1139 would expand provisions of the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program and create two new federal grants under the program. Under current law, this program provides in excess of \$1 billion in federal grants annually. The specific provisions of the bill are summarized below.

- Expands current federal grant authority of the Attorney General to make grants for public safety and community policing programs (COPS ON THE BEAT grant program), to include:
  - training officers;
  - awarding grants to hire school resource officers;
  - establishing school-based partnerships between local law enforcement agencies and local school systems to combat crime, grants, drug activity, and other problems in and around elementary and secondary schools;
  - **paying for officers hired to perform intelligence, anti-terror, or homeland security duties;**
  - establishing and implementing “innovative programs” to reduce and prevent illegal drug manufacturing, distribution, including the use of methamphetamine; and
  - meeting “emerging law enforcement needs, as warranted.”
- **Establishes a new federal grant program** (Troops-to-Cops Program) to hire former members of the Armed Forces to serve as career law enforcement officers for deployment in community-oriented policing, “particularly in communities that are adversely affected by a recent military base closing.” **Note:** In other words, communities that do not have a recently-closed military base (i.e. – those that have had a military base or currently have an operating military base) would be less likely to receive this grant.
- **Establishes a new federal grant program** to develop and use new technologies (including interoperable communications technologies and other new technologies) to assist state and local law enforcement agencies to prevent crime instead of reacting to crime.
- Grants the Department of Justice exclusive authority over the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services to perform functions and activities under COPS ON THE BEAT grant program.
- Allows any grant recipient (under the COPS program) to retain each additional law enforcement officer created under that grant for at least 12 months after the end of the period of the grant (unless the Attorney General waives this retention program).
- Authorizes the Attorney General to renew grants and extend grant periods if the grant recipient can demonstrate “significant progress” (not defined) in achieving the objectives of the initial application.

**Additional Background:** The COPS program was created in 1994 under the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-322). In 2005, Congress reauthorized (through FY 2009) the COPS program as part of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act (P.L. 109-162), and changed it from a multi-grant program to a single-grant program. For additional information on the COPS program, please view this [CRS brief](#).

**Possible Conservative Concerns:**

- ***New Programs.*** H.R. 1139 would expand the scope of the COPS program and create at least two new federal grant programs. As such, conservatives may be concerned about this significant federal subsidy for what are largely local crime issues.
- ***Massive Funding Increase.*** This program currently receives funding of about \$1 billion annually, and **H.R. 1139 would increase that amount by 72 percent to \$1.8 billion per year.** This is particularly noteworthy, considering the bill is being considered under suspension of the rules – without the opportunity for amendment for extended debate. The program also received an additional \$1 billion in funding in the “stimulus” bill.
- ***Misspent Funds.*** According to the Minority Views of the Judiciary Committee, “The Inspector General of the Department of Justice and the Government Accountability Office note that thousands of hires funded by the COPS program never materialized because law enforcement agencies used COPS funding to cover their own budget shortfalls. Looking at just 3% of all COPS grants, federal audits have alleged \$277 million in misspent funds.”
- ***Ineffective Program.*** The COPS program has received mixed reviews by the OMB’s Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) in past years, and **received a grade of “[NOT PERFORMING: Results Not Demonstrated](#)” in the latest Review.** Specifically, PART observed that the COPS program was designed to significantly impact and increase community policing practices, and while COPS still requires that grantees use community policy practices, “these are now sufficiently widespread that it is unclear why a substantial federal subsidy is required to sustain them.” The PART assessment went on to state that “COPS has not been able to define or quantify the remaining unmet “need” for community policy beyond the number of grant applications it receives.

**Additional Information:** For more analysis of the COPS program, please see the [Heritage Report from September 2008](#).

**Committee Action:** H.R. 1139 was introduced on February 23, 2009, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The bill was marked-up and reported (amended) to the House by a vote of 17-7.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** According to CBO, the bill will authorize \$9 billion over five years.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** Yes, as noted above, the bill would create at least two new federal programs and expand the COPS program significantly.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Constitutional Authority:** A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable. However, the Committee Report for H.R. 1700 from the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress cites article I, section 8 of the Constitution (powers of Congress section).

**RSC Staff Contact:** Natalie Farr; [natalie.farr@mail.house.gov](mailto:natalie.farr@mail.house.gov) 202-226-0718.

---

## **H.R. 1626—Statutory Time-Periods Technical Amendments Act (*Johnson, D-GA*)**

**Order of Business:** The bill is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, April 22, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** H.R. 1626 makes technical corrections to slightly alter time deadlines in 28 statutory provisions that affect court proceedings.

**Additional Background:** According to the House Judiciary Committee minority staff, the changes are necessary because of amendments to the time computation rules in the Federal Rules of Practice and Procedure that are due to take effect on December 1, 2009. These amendments changed calculating deadlines to count weekends and holidays for all time periods, whereas before the amendments were enacted, weekends and holidays were excluded for some short time periods. The changes in H.R. 1626 provide short extensions of some short deadlines in order to offset the shortening caused by the new rules.

**Committee Action:** H.R. 1626 was introduced on March 19, 2009, and referred to the Committee on Judiciary and the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Neither Committee took any subsequent action.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** No CBO score was available at press time.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?** No.

**Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** A committee report regarding compliance with House

Rules regarding earmarks and limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits was not available.

**Constitutional Authority:** A committee report citing constitutional authority was not available.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Natalie Farr; [natalie.farr@mail.house.gov](mailto:natalie.farr@mail.house.gov) 202-226-0718.

---

## **H.R. 1824 – Best Buddies Empowerment for People with Intellectual Disabilities Act (*Hoyer, D-MD*)**

**Order of Business:** The bill is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, April 22, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** H.R. 1824 would create a grant program administered by the Department of Education directly to the Best Buddies program. In order to be eligible for a grant, Best Buddies shall submit an application containing a description of activities to be carried out and information on “specific measurable goals and objectives to be achieved through activities carried out...” The bill also requires that Best Buddies report annually to the Secretary of Education on the progress towards meeting the goals described in the application.

The bill authorizes \$10 million for FY2010 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the following four years.

**Additional Background:** Best Buddies is a social and recreational program for people with intellectual disabilities. It is an international organization involved on 1,300 middle school, high school, and college campuses. The program operates by matching students with disabilities with other students to spur friendships.

**Conservative Concerns:** Some conservatives may be concerned that this bill constitutes an earmark to the Best Buddies program.

**Committee Action:** H.R. 1824 was introduced on March 31, 2009, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. No subsequent action was taken on the bill.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The bill authorizes \$10 million for the first year and such sums in each subsequent year.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?** No.

**Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** A committee report regarding compliance with House Rules regarding earmarks and limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits was not available. However, the bill creates a direct funding stream toward a nonprofit organization, and this is an earmark.

**Constitutional Authority:** A committee report citing constitutional authority is not available.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Natalie Farr; [natalie.farr@mail.house.gov](mailto:natalie.farr@mail.house.gov) 202-226-0718.

---

### **H.Res. 247--Expressing support for “National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day” (*Skelton, D-MO*)**

**Order of Business:** The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, April 22, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

**Summary:** H.Res. 247 resolves that the House of Representatives:

- “Expresses support for designation of ‘National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day’; and
- “Commends all of the hard work and dedication that rehabilitation counselors provide to individuals in need and the numerous efforts that the multiple professional organizations have made to assisting those who require rehabilitation.”

The resolution lists a number of findings including:

- “Rehabilitation counselors conduct assessments, provide counseling, support to families, and plan and implement rehabilitation programs for those in need;
- “The purpose of the professional organizations in rehabilitation is to promote the improvement of rehabilitation services available to persons with disabilities through quality education and rehabilitation research for counselors;
- “The various professional organizations, including the National Rehabilitation Association (NRA), Rehabilitation Counselors and Educators Association (RCEA), the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE), the National Rehabilitation Counseling Association (NRCA), the American Rehabilitation Counseling Association (ARCA), the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification (CRCC), the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation (CSAVR), and the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) have stood firm to advocate up-to-date education and training and the maintenance of professional standards in the field of rehabilitation counseling and education;
- “On March 22, 1983, Martha Walker of Kent State University, who was President of the NCRE, testified before the Subcommittee on Select Education of the House

- of Representatives, and was instrumental in bringing to the attention of Congress the need for rehabilitation counselors to be qualified;
- “The efforts of Martha Walker led to the enactment of laws that now require rehabilitation counselors to have proper credentials in order to provide a higher level of quality service to those in need; and
  - “March 22, 2009, would be an appropriate date to recognize ‘National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day’.”

**Committee Action:** H.Res. 247 was introduced on March 16, 2009 and referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor, which took no subsequent public action.

**Administration Position:** No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The resolution would not authorize any additional expenditures.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?:** Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Natalie Farr; [natalie.farr@mail.house.gov](mailto:natalie.farr@mail.house.gov) 202-226-0718.

---

---

## **H.Res. 336—Acknowledging and Commending National Library Week (Ehlers, R-MI)**

**Order of Business:** The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, April 22, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

**Summary:** H.Res. 336 resolves that the House of Representatives:

- "Supports the goals and ideals of National Library Week; and
- "Encourages all residents to visit a library to take advantage of the wonderful library resources available, and to thank their libraries and library workers for making information accessible to all who walk through the library's doors."

The resolution lists a number of findings including:

- “The Nation’s school, academic, public, and special libraries make a difference in the lives of millions of people in the United States, today, more than ever;

- “Librarians are trained professionals, helping people of all ages and backgrounds find and interpret the information they need to live, learn, and work in a challenging economy;
- “Libraries are part of the American Dream, places for opportunity, education, self-help, and lifelong learning.”

**Committee Action:** H.Res. 336 was introduced on April 21, 2009 and referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor, which took no subsequent public action.

**Administration Position:** No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The resolution would not authorize any additional expenditures.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?:** Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Natalie Farr; [natalie.farr@mail.house.gov](mailto:natalie.farr@mail.house.gov) 202-226-0718.